

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 have been cancelled and new claims 16-35 have been added as a substitute therefor. No new matter has been added in claims 16-35. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, in view of informalities in the claims.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13 and 14 have been canceled and replaced by new claims 16-35, of which claim 16 is an independent method claim and claim 30 is an independent apparatus claim. Claims 16-35 have been drafted in better compliance with U.S. practice and in consideration of the Examiner's comments as to the informalities in the original claims.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 16-35 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and therefore the Examiner's rejection of original claims 1-3, 5-11, 13 and 14 on these grounds has been overcome and should be removed.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Prior to discussing the rejections, a brief review of the invention is beneficial. The invention relates to a horizontally loaded cargo unit and method for securing the same to a vessel and to other similar cargo units. To this end, a

first securing mechanism is arranged on a first longitudinally-extending vertical side of the cargo unit along with a first locking mechanism. A second securing mechanism is arranged on a second longitudinal-extending vertical side, opposite to the first side, along with a second locking mechanism. The second securing mechanism has a form engageable with the first securing mechanism while the second locking mechanism has a form engageable with the first locking mechanism and such that relative vertical movement between engaged first and second locking mechanisms is prevented. The securing mechanisms and locking mechanisms are arranged to enable the cargo unit to be secured to an adjacent cargo unit in a transverse direction perpendicular to the longitudinal direction by positioning the cargo unit alongside the adjacent cargo unit such that the first side of the cargo unit faces the second side of the adjacent cargo unit, engaging the first securing mechanism on the cargo unit with the second securing mechanism on the adjacent cargo unit, and engaging the first locking mechanism on the cargo unit with the second locking mechanism on the adjacent cargo unit. In this manner, a series of engaged cargo units, optionally also engaged with a vessel in the same manner, is provided.

Using the foregoing securing and locking mechanisms, transverse movements of the cargo units relative to the driving direction of the vessel are prevented and vertical movements of the cargo units relative to one another are

prevented.

The cited prior art does not teach or suggest cargo units including the features now set forth in the claims.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Strecker (U.S. Patent No. 3,776,169).

Strecker describes a stowing system for freight containers including corner fittings 28 and 29 arranged at the corners of each container 15,17,19 and steel beams 25,26,27 which extend transversely, i.e., perpendicular to the longitudinal, driving direction of the vessel and the direction in which the containers 15,17,29 are oriented. Beams 25, 26, 27 are provided with twist-locks 75. By means of the corner fittings 28,29, beams 25, 26, 27 and twist-locks 75, the containers 15,17,19 are secured to one another and to the vessel.

In contrast to the embodiments of the invention now set forth in independent claims 16 and 30, Strecker does not disclose, teach or suggest arranging first and second securing mechanism on longitudinally-extending vertical sides of cargo units and also first and second locking mechanisms on the vertical sides of the cargo units. Also with respect to claim 16, Strecker also does not disclose positioning each cargo unit alongside an adjacent cargo unit in a transverse direction and engaging securing and locking mechanisms on the two cargo units together.

Appl. No. 09/937,970  
Amdt. dated Oct. 9, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of Jun. 18, 2003

In view of the content of new claims 16 and 30, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of the claims in view of Strecker has been overcome and should be removed.

Claims 1, 7-9, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Goodwin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2,159,479).

Goodwin et al. describes a system for securing cargo units to a railway car. As shown in Figs. 1 and 2, two vehicles are placed on each railway car and secured to the car.

In contrast to the embodiments of the invention now set forth in independent claims 16 and 30, Goodwin et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest arranging first and second securing mechanism on longitudinally-extending vertical sides of cargo units and also first and second locking mechanisms on the vertical sides of the cargo units. There are no securing mechanism or locking mechanism which provide for coupling of cargo units placed alongside one another such that their longitudinally-extending sides face one another.

Also with respect to claim 16, Goodwin et al. also does not disclose positioning each cargo unit alongside an adjacent cargo unit in a transverse direction and engaging securing and locking mechanisms on the two cargo units together.

In view of the content of new claims 16 and 30, it is respectfully submitted

Appl. No. 09/937,970  
Amdt. dated Oct. 9, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of Jun. 18, 2003

that the Examiner's rejection of the claims in view of Goodwin et al. has been overcome and should be removed.

In view of the above amendments and arguments presented herein it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome and should be removed and the present application should now be in condition for allowance.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By: M G R  
Martin G. Raskin  
Reg. No. 25,642

11 May 2003  
Keith D. Moore  
res. no. 44951

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.  
1140 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
Tel.: (212) 768-3800

Encl.  
Petition for one-month extension